

PATRIOTISM OR NATIONAL BETRAYAL?

—On the Reactionary Film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*—

CHI PEN-YU

Supplement to **CHINA RECONSTRUCTS**, May 1967

PATRIOTISM OR NATIONAL BETRAYAL?

— On the Reactionary Film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*

CHI PEN-YU

At no time since it was shown all over the country has the film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* — described as patriotic though in fact a film of national betrayal — yet been criticized and repudiated.

— Chairman Mao Tse-tung: Letter on the Question of Studies of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"

WHEN the new day dawned over the east of the world in October 1949, China, which had been weighed down by calamities, rose to its feet like a giant.

Guided by Mao Tse-tung's thought, the Chinese people, after countless bitter struggles, finally threw off the three big mountains that had weighed upon them — imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism — and liberated the whole country.

The storm of the great people's revolution was washing away the filth from the land of China. But the reactionary ruling classes, unreconciled to their doom, continued to undertake frenzied, large-scale counterattacks in every field. The class struggle was very acute. It was especially complicated on the cultural and ideological fronts, and the reactionary films, plays, operas, songs and journals that flooded the world of culture were important propaganda weapons in the big counterattacks carried out by the reactionary ruling classes against the revolutionary people. One of the most glaring examples was the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which in 1950 was still being widely shown in Peking, Shanghai and other cities.

What should be the attitude of the victorious Chinese people in face of such large-scale counterattacks by reactionary culture? Should they carry out a proletarian cultural revolution, or compromise or surrender to the reactionary culture rampant in society? Every revolutionary comrade faced a new choice and test.

Around this reactionary film, the proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao waged a serious struggle against a handful of Party people in authority taking the capitalist road. It was the first major struggle on the cultural and ideological fronts in liberated China.

Chairman Mao sternly pointed out: "*Inside Story of the Ching Court* is a film of national betrayal and should be criticized and repudiated." He also said: "Somebody called it patriotic; I consider it national betrayal, national betrayal through and through." But the counter-revolutionary revisionists Lu Ting-yl and Chou Yang and a certain Hu, an administrative vice-head of the Propaganda Department of the Party Central Committee at that time, and others, as well as the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, clung stubbornly to their bourgeois reactionary stand and openly opposed Chairman Mao's directive. They asserted that this reactionary film was "patriotic" and refused to criticize and repudiate it.

Comrade Chiang Ching, then a member of a committee for guiding film work under the Ministry of Culture, upheld the proletarian revolutionary line of Chairman Mao and at a number of meetings proposed that the film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* be firmly criticized and repudiated. However, Lu Ting-yl, Chou Yang, Hu and others vigorously opposed this proposal and did their best to advertise the "patriotic progressiveness" of this reactionary film. When Comrade Chiang Ching wanted to act according to Chairman Mao's directive, they threw at her the reactionary talk of their boss behind the scenes, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road.

This article first appeared in the No. 5, 1967 issue of the magazine *Hongqi* (Red Flag), published by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

saying: "Comrade so-and-so holds that it is a patriotic film." Firmly upholding the truth, Comrade Chiang Ching stood her ground and, refuting their reactionary and judicious statements in no uncertain terms, insisted that the film should be criticized and repudiated. They had to give way, but perfunctorily appointed an historian of reactionary views to write a short luke-warm criticism which was really aimed at silencing the film. They considered such an article "too sharp" and held up publication, thus smothering a major struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisies on the cultural and ideological fronts.

In 1951, Chairman Mao personally led the struggles on the cultural and ideological fronts to criticize the reactionary film *The Life of Wu Han*.¹ In 1954 he initiated another major nationwide struggle, namely, the criticism of Yu Ping-po's *Studios of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"*² and the reactionary ideas of Hu Shih. On October 10 of the same year, Chairman Mao wrote a letter to the comrades in the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party and other comrades concerned, sternly criticizing certain "important people" in the Party who suppressed attacks by new-born forces against the bourgeoisies and were ill-willing captives. In his letter, Chairman Mao again raised the question of the reactionary film *Inside Story of the China Court*. Referring to the article written by two young men criticizing *Studios of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"*, Chairman Mao pointed out:

This is the first serious attack in thirty years and moia on the atrocious slava of a so-called authorialist writer in the field of the studios at *The Dream of the Red Chamber*. The authors are two young League members. First they wrote to the Wenyi Bao (*Literary Gazette*), to ask whistis; it was all right to criticize Yu Ping-po, but they received no reply. Ignored by the Wenyi Bao, they wrote to teachers at their alma mater—Shantung University—and got their support. Their article relating *A Brief Comment on "The Dream of the Red Chamber"* was carried in the university journal *Wenhue* (*Literature, History and Philosophy*). Then the problem came back again to Peking. Some people wanted this article to be reprinted in the *Asiatic Ribao* (*People's Daily*), to arouse discussion and criticism. This was not done because

¹*The Life of Wu Han* was a most pernicious counter-revolutionary film which fervently praised the landlord class and its lackeys, frenziedly advocated the most shameless selfishness and capitalism, and maliciously slandered the peasants' revolutionary struggles. Wu Han (1878-1959) was a landlord's toady whom the film turned into a "great man" willing to sacrifice himself to provide poor peasant children with a chance to study.—T.

²*Studios of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"* is a book which evaluated this classical novel from the bourgeois idealist point of view and used bourgeois methods of literary research.—T.

certain people opposed it, giving various reasons (mainly that it was "an article written by unimportant people" and "the Party paper is not a platform for free debates"). As a compromise, the article was allowed to be reprinted in the Wenyi Bao. Later, the "Literary Legacy" page of the *Guangming Ribao* carried an article by the two young men refuting Yu Ping-po's book. *Studios of "The Dream of the Red Chamber"*. It seems likely that the struggle is about to start against the bourgeois idealism of the school of Hu Shih which has been poisoning young people in the field of classical literature for the last thirty years and more. This struggle has been sparked by two "unimportant people", while the "important people", usually taking no notice of it or even abstracting it, advocate a united front on idealism with bourgeois writers and make themselves willing captives of the bourgeoisie. It was almost the same when the film *Inside Story of the China Court* and *This Life of Wu Han* were shown. At no time since it was shown all over the country has the film *Inside Story of the China Court*—described as patriotic though in fact a film of national betrayal—yet been criticized and repudiated. *The Life of Wu Han* has been criticized, but the lessons have not been drawn; now comes the bizarre situation in which Yu Ping-po's idealism is tolerated while the publication of vigorous article essays by some "unimportant people" is obstructed. This warrants our attention.

Yet class struggle is independent of man's will. Even after Chairman Mao put the question forward so sharply, the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists headed by Liu Ting-yi and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, still continued to cling to the bourgeois reactionary stand and stubbornly opposed Chairman Mao's instructions. Twelve years have elapsed since 1954, but the *Inside Story of the China Court*, which is a reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film, remains uncriticized.

The unprecedented great proletarian cultural revolution has once again brought up this question.

Debts have to be paid sooner or later. In the present movement, the great proletarian cultural revolution, this reactionary and completely traitorous film, which has remained uncriticized since the liberation, must be subjected to thorough criticism and repudiation by the revolutionary masses. The handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists who opposed Chairman Mao's directive, and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, must also be thoroughly criticized and repudiated by the revolutionary masses during this movement. Accounts must be settled with them in full for their crimes of flagrantly opposing Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and of recklessly

opposing the Party and Mao Tse-tung's thought. The revolutionary masses must overthrow this handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists, remove the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road from his position and make him stand aside.

The reactionary film *Inside Story of the China Court* has a so-called historical theme. It deals with the Reform Movement of 1898 and the struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan Movement in the last years of the Ching dynasty. It openly takes the stand of imperialism, feudalism and the reactionary bourgeoisie. It freely distorts historical facts and prettifies imperialism, feudalism and bourgeois reformism. While eulogizing the royalists, it slanders the revolutionary mass movement and the heroic struggle of the people against imperialism and feudalism and advocates national capitulation and class capitulation.

This reactionary film was made by the Yungkuo Film Company, a reactionary film studio whose first film was *The Soul of a Nation*. That film had conjured up the phantom of Wan Tien-haog in an attempt to revive the dying Chiang Kai-shek regime. *Inside Story of the China Court* was its second production. The scenario writer Yao Ks is a reactionary scribbler who holds stubbornly to the counter-revolutionary stand. Earlier, he edited the reactionary monthly *Tien Halo*, opposed the Chinese revolution and actively served British-American imperialism and the comprador-bourgeoisies. Later he sold himself to the Kuomintang reactionaries and wrote a series of vulgar, reactionary plays. It was a minor run-around of the reactionary ruling classes. On the eve of China's liberation, he escaped to Hongkong. There he nothing strange in a reactionary anti-Communist, anti-popular, literary man writing such a reactionary scenario at *Inside Story of the China Court*. But it is indeed strange that the head and certain vice-heads of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party who donned the cloak of "Communists" and "proletarian revolutionaries", and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, thereby taking the capitalist road who backed them, should extend such favour to this extremely reactionary, thoroughly traitorous film, extol it as "patriotic", and actively serve as spokesmen for imperialism, feudalism and the reactionary bourgeoisie. Doesn't this call for deep thought?

On the question of his attitudes to be adopted towards this reactionary, thoroughly traitorous film, what are the major differences in principle between the proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao on the one hand and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, on the other hand? To sum up briefly, there are three differences, namely: what should be one's attitude towards imperialist aggression; towards the Yi Ho Tuan revolutionary mass movement; and towards bourgeois reformism?

What Should Be One's Attitude Towards Imperialist Aggression?

The contradiction between imperialism and the Chinese people is the principal contradiction in modern Chinese society. Imperialism is the first and most ferocious enemy of the Chinese people. What attitude one should take towards imperialist aggression is a question of first importance for the revolution.

The reactionary film *Inside Story of the China Court*, which was praised as "patriotic" by a handful of counter-revolutionary traitors and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, is, on the question of imperialist aggression, a perfect reflection of an utterly shameful and servile attitude of lost and worship of imperialist and pro-imperialism.

It expresses a moral trait of the imperialist aggression committed by the so-called "eight-power allied expedition" organized by Britain, the United States, Germany, Russia, Japan, France, Italy and Austria. It astoundingly preaches lost of imperialism, crying that "since the Sino-Japanese War of 1911, China has suffered financial losses, her armed forces are poorly equipped and weak, . . . and she is far inferior to the enemy in strength," that "it must not start hostilities with any foreign country." How Ching-sheng, a high-ranking mandarin, is so scared of imperialism that he wails aloud:

Chairman Mao teaches us that before the wild beasts of imperialism revolutionary people must not show the slightest timidity. But in the eyes of the scientist and those who praised the film, this is an alternative but to surrender helplessly to imperialist aggression—all this is naked national capitulation, the philosophy of quailings.

Moreover, the film painstakingly advocates worship of imperialism and pro-imperialism; it goes all out to spread illusions about imperialism and openly peddles the theory of national betrayal. Through the mouth of the imperialist concubine Chen Fei, an agent of imperialism as presented in the film, the scientist openly welcomes imperialist aggression against China. Chen Fei puts it bluntly: "The foreign powers will certainly not blame Your Majesty"; "I am sure that certainly not blame Your Majesty, but the foreign powers will not harm Your Majesty, but the foreign powers will help Your Majesty restore the on the contrary will help Your Majesty restore the Sun throne and regenerate the imperial regime." Sun Chiao-an, a high-ranking mandarin, also asserts: "The Chinese, a high-spirited nation, also asserts: 'The envoys of both the eastern and western powers are sympathetic towards Your Majesty.' A comparison of this with the counter-revolutionary propaganda of the imperialists who committed aggression against China at the time shows clearly that the film advocates exactly what the imperialists proclaimed. To

¹ Chen Fei (1876-1960), concubine of Emperor Kuang Hsin.

deceit its people, least Russia, for example alleged that it was "not fighting against China", "but merely putting down a riot, suppressing rebels and helping China's legitimate government to restore order". In *The War in China*, his first article on China written as early as 1900, Lenin mercilessly refuted such counter-revolutionary arguments put forward by the aggressors.

What in fact is the "patriotism" in *Inside Story of the Ching Court* so extolled by a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them? The "patriotism" they praised turns out to be the so-called "patriotism" of the Emperor K'ang Hsi and his ilk who did not hesitate to rely on imperialism to restore and consolidate their rule over the people, as he described in the film. After the Chinese people had overthrown the reactionary rule of imperialism and feudalism, they still continued to urge the people to learn the "patriotism" of turning traitor in order to restore and consolidate the exploiting classes' rule over the people. Such is their vicious intention!

Chairman Mao teaches us: "The specific content of patriotism is determined by historical conditions. There is the 'patriotism' of the Japanese aggressors and of Hitler, and there is our patriotism. Communists must resolutely oppose the 'patriotism' of the Japanese aggressors and of Hitler." Likewise, we must resolutely oppose the so-called "patriotism" (namely, an out-and-out theory of national betrayal) advocated by a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road.

The traitorous argument about welcoming imperialism to help China "regenerate the imperial regime" advocated by the film comes out of the same bag as the gangster logic of U.S. imperialism. Singing the same tune as those earlier imperialists did when they carried out aggression against China, ex-U.S. Secretary of State Acheson in his 1949 "White Paper" talked at length about U.S. "concern" for China and described aggression as "friendship". Chairman Mao Tse-tung, in *Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle, 'Friendship' or Aggression?* and other articles, had already sternly rebuffed such counter-revolutionary gangster logic. He had pointed out that it is "the logic of the U.S. mandarins" to describe aggression as "friendship". Yet a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them yielded to imperialist pressure and were morally afraid of imperialism. They vainly hoped to arrange a compromise with imperialism and get "understanding" and "help" from it. They were deeply dissatisfied with Chairman Mao's great call, "cast away illusions, prepare for struggle." These energetic boosters of this reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film *Inside Story*

of the Ching Court was in fact open opposition to Chairman Mao's criticism and repudiation of Acheson's "White Paper". This was an unbridled attack on Mao Tse-tung's thought.

Obviously, the reason why this reactionary film company and reactionary scribbler made such a film on the eve of China's liberation, a film that advocates imperialist "help" in "regenerating the imperial regime", was that they wanted to use their film to arouse public opinion for their own reactionary purposes and openly advocate reliance on U.S. imperialism to suppress the revolutionary movement of the Chinese people, a stratagem they proposed to the Kuomintang reactionaries who were on their last legs. The film entirely takes the stand of imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries. It represents an attempt to help prop up the tottering reactionary regime to meet the needs of U.S. imperialist aggression against China and to serve U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. The handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists who paid lip-service to "opposing imperialism", and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them, eulogized this reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film and called it "patriotic". Doesn't this expose their true lectures as sham anti-imperialist and genuine capitulationists? What country do they love? Their love is for a country dominated by the imperialists, a country dominated by the landlords and the bourgeoisie, but not our great motherland under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "patriotism" they eulogize is nothing but the theory of national betrayal which all the revolutionary people of our country want to trample underfoot.

One thing in particular needs to be pointed out. It is by no means accidental that the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road should have praised a reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film as "patriotic". As early as the first days after the victory of the War of Resistance Against Japan he was frightened when faced with aggression by U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. Despairing of the future of the Chinese revolution, he actively promoted within the Party a line of national capitulation and class capitulation in what he described as a "new stage of peace and democracy". Chairman Mao called on us to "cast away illusions", to "give the enemy a fit to eat" and "fight for every inch of land", whereas this person energetically spread illusions about peace with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys and impudently wrote articles in newspapers in which he expressed gratitude for U.S. imperialist "help" to China and begged for "peace" from U.S. imperialism in an attempt to numb the fighting will of the people. He even deceived the people by saying that "the main form of struggle in the Chinese revolution has become peaceful and parliamentary... It is legal mass struggle and parliamentary struggle... there should be a change in the whole of the Party's work," and "all political issues should be settled peacefully." Chairman Mao said that as our enemy "is now sharpening his swords,

we must sleep on our toes". Yet this person wanted the people to hand over the weapons they held in their hands. Energetically advertising the theory of national betrayal, he took the enemy for a father and wanted to be a willing slave of U.S. imperialism. He said: "Since the U.S. insists on seeking compradors in China, we, too, may act as its compradors, red compradors." Compradors are compradors. They are running dogs of the imperialists. What's all this about "red compradors"? It is a pure lie. With such a mean and shameless slave mentality, long ago eager to be compradors for the imperialists, these persons found the reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* extremely well-suited to their taste. This was because the theory advocated by Chen Fei, the imperialist agent in the film, that imperialism could help China "regenerate the imperial regime" exactly reflected their traitorous mentality of eagerly wanting to become compradors of imperialism!

"Hearts which have a common beat are linked," This is a line of verse the Emperor Kuang Hsi reads out in the film while looking dejectedly at a lake. This is an apt description of the fact that the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road shared the feelings of Kuang Hsi, his concubine and their ilk. On the question of serving as imperialist agents, the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them echoed the views of the landlords and the bourgeoisie of over 600 years ago. This is the ideological and the class root of their praise for the "patriotism" of this reactionary, out-and-out traitorous film.

What Should Be One's Attitude Towards the Yi Ho Tuan Revolutionary Mass Movement?

Chairman Mao says: "In the final analysis, the innumerable truths of Marxism may be expressed in one sentence: 'rebellion is justified.'" What should be one's attitude towards the revolutionary movement of all-out rebellion against imperialism and feudalism launched by the revolutionary masses of the Yi Ho Tuan? Should one support it or oppose it? Should one praise it or hate it? This is a touchstone distinguishing genuine left from fake revolutionaries, revolutionaries from counter-revolutionaries.

The Yi Ho Tuan movement which shook our vast land was a great anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolutionary mass movement in modern Chinese history. It was a great movement typifying the creative spirit of the Chinese people in their history. At that time, the Yi Ho Tuan carried on revolutionary activities in town and country throughout most of the northern part of China. It set up more than 800 meeting

places in the city of Peking itself, the political center where the enemy exercised the tightest rule. Youths who had joined the Yi Ho Tuan drilled regularly every day under the palace walls behind Chingshan.

At a crucial moment when our country was in the process of being partitioned among the imperialists, the Yi Ho Tuan heroes bravely stepped forth, raised aloft the great revolutionary banner of patriotic struggle against imperialism, and waged a heroic fight against the imperialist hooligans and their lackeys. They splashed the street corners with slogans of every description which gave expression to the firm resolve of the Chinese people to fight the imperialists:

"Restore to us our land and rights! We'll light our way!

Through seas of fire and over mountains of daggers!

What does it matter if the Emperor has surrendered?

We'll not rest till the last foreign invader is dead!"

They held the imperialists in contempt; they strictly banned imported goods. They renamed the "Legation Street", where foreign legations were located, "Block the Aliens Street" and the Yi Ho Bridge, "Stop the Aliens Bridge". Demonstrating in the streets, the Yi Ho Tuan heroes often chanted the slogan "Kill the foreign devils" in chorus with the inhabitants, making the imperialists shake in their boots. Some foreigners were so frightened that they hid themselves in cellars and hired professional mourners to carry them out of the city.

In June 1900, Yi Ho Tuan revolutionary activities reached a climax. Day and night, in groups of 30, 40 or 50, the Yi Ho Tuan detachments from Peking's outlying districts marched on the city. Scores of groups arrived each day. The guards at the city gates stood of attention to salute them and shouted in the crowds to make way. Long columns of the revolutionary people in red turbans, red sashes, and shoes trimmed in red, armed with swords and spears, marched with immense dignity in grand parades through the Peking streets. And the blacksmiths outside Chenmen worked day and night before their blazing furnaces making swords and spears for the Yi Ho Tuan.

Faced with the frenzied repression of the imperialist aggressor forces, the revolutionary masses of the Yi Ho Tuan heroically pitted their primitive swords and spears against the invaders armed with modern rifles and guns. They demonstrated the Chinese people's militant, revolutionary spirit of fearlessness. In the famous battle at the railway town of Langfang to halt the enemy's advance on Peking, the Yi Ho Tuan "blockaded in the train and heavily challenged with spears" an allied force of

more than 1,500 men led by British Admiral Seymour. The enemy lost nearly 50 per cent of his strength, and beat a panicky retreat to Tientsin. Later Seymour, recalling his light, remarked that had the "Boxers" been armed with western weapons, the allied force he led would have been completely annihilated. In the battle to defend Tientsin, the Yi Ho Tuan fought the aggressor's army hand-to-hand. In one engagement of the railway station, they killed or wounded more than 500 men of an opposing Russian aggressor force of 2,000. The imperialists were forced to admit that they had never before seen anything like the way the Chinese fought the western soldiers in the bitter battle at Tientsin which went on fiercely for over a month. In the battle at Yangtsun, the U.S. imperialist aggressor army was mercilessly trounced by the Yi Ho Tuan fighters. From then on the imperialist aggressor armies shuddered at the very bugle calls of the Yi Ho Tuan. They wailed: "Those long brass trumpets can make one's blood curdle. . ."

Young people formed a most active and lively force in the Yi Ho Tuan movement. They performed immortal deeds in this great revolutionary movement. The Hung Teng Chao (Red Lanterns) which amazed China and the world was an organization of young women from many places in northern China. They formed themselves into a well-disciplined force, did military exercises and defended their homeland. They wore dressed in red, wore red caps, carried red lanterns and red spears. They fought at the front and looted out spies in the rear. Playing an active part in the Yi Ho Tuan ranks and resolutely opposing imperialism and its lackeys, they displayed the heroic anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolutionary spirit of China's young women.

"The Hung Teng Chao and the Yi Ho Tuan are like real brothers and sisters in revolt. They are united as one, and as one they fight the foreign officials." This dilly expressed the resolute determination of the Hung Teng Chao to fight the imperialists.

Tales of the heroic deeds of the Hung Teng Chao have circulated widely among the masses of the people ever since. One saying was: "Those Hung Teng girls stare death fearlessly in the face when they charge the enemy positions. Their only worry is that they may lag behind under the hail of enemy bullets." Another comment was: "Since the reigns of Tao Kuang and Hsien Feng all the battles at sea and on the land in coastal China against the alien invaders ended in defeat" but "now these girls are giving the foreigners such a trouncing that their victories have struck terror into the hearts of those foreign countries, and heightened the spirits of the Chinese people."

The heroic struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan is the glory and pride of the Chinese people and one of the foundation stones of the great victory of the Chinese people fifty years later. It gave the aggressors a taste of the iron fists of the Chinese people and smashed

the imperialists' pipe dream of "partitioning" China. Von Waldsee, commander of the invading imperialist armies, reported to the German Kaiser: Your Majesty may entertain the idea of partitioning China, but let it not be forgotten. . . there is still immense vitality in them. The Chinese have not lost all their bellicosity, which may be seen in the recent "Boxer Movement". Whether Europe or America or Japan, he said, no country was intellectually or militarily equipped for the job of ruling over this one-quarter of mankind. It was therefore an ill-advised policy to try dismemberment.

Real Marxists have always enthusiastically praised revolutionary mass movements of such a tremendous scale. In his great works Chairman Mao gives a high appraisal to the Yi Ho Tuan movement and repeatedly extols its heroic deeds. He regards the Yi Ho Tuan movement as an important stage in the development of China's bourgeois democratic revolution. Chairman Mao has pointed out that the Yi Ho Tuan war was a just war against the oppressors. Like other revolutionary wars of the Chinese people in the last hundred years, it testifies to "the Chinese people's indomitable spirit in fighting imperialism and its lackeys."¹⁰ It shows that "we Chinese have the spirit in light the enemy to the last drop of our blood, the determination to recover our lost territory by our own efforts, and the ability to stand on our own feet in the family of nations."¹¹ Thanks to the Chinese people's unrelenting and heroic struggle during the last hundred years, imperialism has not been able to subjugate China, nor will it ever be able to do so.¹²

But the reactionary and thoroughly traitorous film *Inside Story of the Ching Court*, which was praised by a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road backing them, expresses deep-rooted class hatred for the anti-imperialist revolutionary mass movement of the Yi Ho Tuan and does its best to defame and slander it. The film portrays the revolutionary action of the Yi Ho Tuan against imperialism as a sort of barbaric turmoil. It tries its utmost to smear the Yi Ho Tuan, maliciously attacking it as a "mad" "mob" who "committed murder and arson," and as "ignorant people" who engaged in "witchcraft".

These malicious slanders against the Yi Ho Tuan in the film and those who praised it are completely in line with the views of the imperialists. At that time Denn Aheson, a chieflain of U.S. imperialism, cursed the Yi Ho Tuan movement in his "White Paper" as "the anti-foreign disturbances in China" and "the Boxer Rebellion". The hired pundits of U.S. imperialism in China were also unbridled in their attacks against the Yi Ho Tuan movement as an "offspring of ignorant superstition and mob hysteria," as "acting senselessly" and as "Boxers" who committed murder and arson.

Was it the Yi Ho Tuan organized by the Chinese people that went to the imperialist countries in Europe and America and in Japan to stage rebellion and "commit murder and arson"? Or was it the imperialist countries that came to invade China, on their own land, to oppress and exploit the Chinese people, thus arousing the masses of the Chinese people to resist imperialism and its lackeys and corrupt officials in China? This is a major question of right and wrong which must be debated and cleared up.

The real bandits who massacred people and committed arson were none other than the imperialists and their lackeys. According to the admissions of Alfred von Waldsee, head of the imperialist invading forces these troops, after occupying Peking, burnt, massacred, plundered, raped, destroyed cultural treasures and committed all manner of crimes. Following their occupation of Peking, the imperialist troops were granted special permission to loot openly for three days. This was followed by robbery on an individual basis. They plundered everything, from the imperial palace and mansions of the princes to the homes of ordinary people. "The windows facing the lake side were widely opened; court officials were alarmed to see a line of camels coming." The historical relics stored in the Summer Palace, a treasure-house of the feudal emperors, were carried away by the aggressors to Tientsin by camels, and this took many a month. Many relics preserved for centuries in China, including the *Yung Lo Encyclopedia*, were burnt or stolen by the imperialists. Von Waldsee also confessed that there were many cases of rape, brutality, willful murder and senseless arson in the course of plunder. As for the massacre and suppression of the Yi Ho Tuan by the imperialists' lackeys, it was even more brutal and callous.

With deep indignation, Lenin condemned the crimes of massacre and arson committed by the imperialist aggressors. He wrote:

"The European governments (the Russian government among the very first) have already started to partition China. . . They began to rob China as goods rob corpses, and when the seeming corpse attempted to awake, they flog themselves upon it like savage beasts, burning down whole villages, shooting, bayoneting and drowning in the Amur River [Heilungkiang River] unarmed inhabitants, their wives and their children. And all these Christian exploits are accompanied by howls against the Chinese barbarians who dared to raise their hands against the civilized Europeans."¹³ But the film and those who praised it turned things upside down. They gave aid and comfort to the evil-doers, portraying the imperialist aggressors who committed murder, arson, robbery and rape as envoys of civilization while slandering the Yi Ho Tuan who resolutely resisted imperialist aggression. This is nothing but the philosophy of quittings and trailers.

The patriotic anti-imperialist struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan was closely linked with the anti-feudal struggle. The battle cries of the Yi Ho Tuan were: "Kill the foreigners and wipe out corrupt officials." A ditty of the time runs as follows: "Slay the foreigners and kill the venally mandarins; great hopes will shine before the common people when the foreigners and mandarins are gone." "First kill the foreign devils and then beat up the corrupt officials." Such were their simple and forthright anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolutionary slogans. They deeply hated the feudal ruling class. In 1900 when the Yi Ho Tuan controlled Peking, most of the offices of the mandarins of the Ching dynasty in the capitol and the mansions of princes, dukes and aristocrats were watched over by members of the Yi Ho Tuan. This Yi Ho Tuan on many occasions caught officials who were notorious for their crimes, especially those subservient to imperialism, and forced them to bow to the ground and repent at the altar set up by the Yi Ho Tuan. Those who had committed the most heinous crimes were put to death.

Yet the film slanders the Yi Ho Tuan as a tool of the feudal ruler. The film portrays Chao Shu-chiao, a high-ranking mandarin of the Ching dynasty, as one who said: "I beg the Empress Dowager to issue an order to organize the Yi Ho Tuan into an imperial army." The Empress Dowager gladly accepts this suggestion. In this way the Yi Ho Tuan are made out to be partisans of the Emperor Tzu Hsi. This is an utterly vicious slander.

For a long period the rulers of the Ching dynasty adapted the policy of dividing and softening up the Yi Ho Tuan. This policy temporarily had some effect and some members of the Yi Ho Tuan were misled into an erroneous view of the rulers of the Ching dynasty. Some detachments of the Yi Ho Tuan put forward the slogan, "Support the Ching dynasty and wipe out the foreigners." This reflects, on the one hand, the complexity of the class contradictions at that time and, on the other hand, the fact that people's understanding of imperialism and its lackeys at that time remained at the stage of perceptual knowledge.

Chairman Mao has taught us that man's knowledge develops from the lower to the higher stage and from perceptual knowledge to rational knowledge. "Similarly with the Chinese people's knowledge of imperialism. The first stage was one of superstitious, perceptual knowledge, as shown in the last-mentioned anti-foreign struggles of the movement of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom, the Yi Ho Tuan movement, and so on. It was only in the second stage that the Chinese people reached the stage of rational knowledge, saw the internal and external contradictions of imperialism and saw the essential truth that imperialism had allied itself with China's comprador and feudal classes to oppress and exploit the great masses of the Chinese people. This knowledge began about the

time of the May 4th Movement of 1919.²¹ Therefore it is absolutely impermissible to slander the Yi Ho Tuan movement as a tool of the feudal rulers just because it failed to see clearly the nature of imperialism and feudalism. As stated above, along with their anti-imperialist activities, the Yi Ho Tuan never for a moment ceased their activities against the Ching dynasty. Even after the appearance of the slogan "Support the Ching dynasty and wipe out the foreigners", Chin Hsing-teng [Red Lantern Club, leader of the Yi Ho Tuan, worked out a plan for an attack on Peking and persevered in the anti-feudal struggle.

It was solely to meet the needs of imperialism and the feudal landlord class that the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* so unscrupulously slandered and attacked the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggle of the Yi Ho Tuan movement. Its slanders and attacks against the revolutionary masses of the Yi Ho Tuan movement reflect the bitter hatred of the class enemy the peasants — the main force of the Chinese revolution — and the bitter hatred of the class enemy of the new-democratic revolutionary movement led by our Party. The handling of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who was backing them were angling the same line as imperialism and feudalism when they applauded this reactionary, thoroughly traitorous film which opposes the Chinese revolution and insults the revolutionary masses. When they did so they were simply serving as mouthpieces for the counter-revolutionary propaganda of imperialism and feudalism. This has completely exposed these counter-revolutionary class stand which is that of the landlords and bourgeoisie.

The fact that the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road so bitterly hates the revolutionary mass movements of history helps us to understand, better why in the current great proletarian cultural revolution he put forward, in collaboration with another top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, a bourgeois reactionary line in the vain attempt to extinguish the revolutionary flames kindled by Chairman Mao himself, who he conspired light and wrong and turned things upside down, organized converging attacks against revolutionaries, oppressed the masses and carried out a white terror, and tried in a hundred and one ways to boost the arrogance of the bourgeoisie and crush the morale of the proletariat.

What Should Be One's Attitude Towards Bourgeois Reformism?

What attitude a person takes towards bourgeois reformism is, in reality, a question of his attitude towards the socialist road and the capitalist road.

With regard to this fundamental question which concerns the line of the Chinese revolution, differ-

ences of principle have long existed between the proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao and the Party people in authority taking the capitalist road. These differences of principle became even more acute after China was liberated. The question of what attitude one should take towards the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* was a point at which these differences came to a head. On the cultural and ideological fronts, this was the first light at close quarters in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and between the socialist road and the capitalist road. In this fight, in their evaluations of the film, the proletarian revolutionaries headed by Chairman Mao on the one hand, and the handling of Party people in authority taking the capitalist road on the other, gave completely different answers to the question of which direction China should take.

A handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road who backed them did their best to laud this reactionary film which opposes revolution and sings the praise of feudalism. They aimed to get help from the "dead souls" of bourgeois reformism and to use the latter's names, robes and slogans to advocate capitalism in China.

The Reform Movement of 1898 which the film glorifies was a reformist movement of the Chinese bourgeoisie. This movement was launched by certain members of the feudal ruling class and a number of bourgeois reformers who were starting to break away from the feudal ruling class. They launched this movement under the threat of a revolutionary storm and the disaster of national subjugation and did in the interests of the landlords and the bourgeoisie. This was an attempt to lead China on to the road of capitalism through reformism by way of modernization and constitutional reform from above.

Under the historical conditions of the time, the 1898 Reform Movement was, to some extent, a blow against the ideological domination of the feudal ruling class and it played a certain enlightening role in the process of ideological emancipation. We have always taken note of this point. However, by such recognition we mean making a critical assessment of historical personages and incidents from the viewpoint of historical materialism. It does not in any way mean an unprincipled glorifying of the 1898 Reform Movement and its representative participants. The representatives of the 1898 Reform Movement were themselves rulers who exploited and oppressed the working people. Their reformist goal did not and could never serve the interests of the people's revolution; it was to consolidate their rule and enable them to exploit the people even more effectively. What they wanted to change was not the essence but only some minor aspects of the old order. The illusion they cherished was simply the transformation

by gradual and devious means of the landlord economy into a semi-feudal and semi-capitalist economy (actually a semi-feudal and semi-colonial economy). This was an attempt to impede the people's revolutionary movement and suppress the revolution in ways that were not apparent on the surface. Even at that time, therefore, reformism could never be the way out for the Chinese people.

At the end of the 19th century, two roads of social change were already being advanced in China: One was the bourgeois reformist road which meant the attempt to get to capitalism by means of constitutional reform and modernization from above. In the historical conditions of China at that time, this could not be other than a false dead-end and reactionary road because China lacked the historical conditions for reformist modernization such as existed in western Europe and Japan. China was then being gradually reduced to a semi-feudal and semi-colonial state under imperialist aggression. Yet Kang Yu-wei and Liang Chi-shao, leaders of the Chinese bourgeois reformists, placed their hopes for constitutional reform and modernization precisely on imperialism. They cherished the illusion that they could realize their aims of constitutional reform and modernization by going over completely to the side of imperialism and relying on its strength. The result could only be to bring a well into the house and accelerate the process of reducing China to a semi-colonial, semi-feudal state in which the development of Chinese capitalism would be absolutely out of the question. The other road of social change was that of the broad masses rising up and making revolution by armed struggle. Both the T'ai-ping Revolution and the Yi Ho Tuan movement took this road. These revolutions could not achieve final victory because they lacked proletarian leadership. However, they dealt heavy blows at imperialism and feudalism and promoted China's historical advance.

"I raise my sword to laugh at the sky." A most tragic and moving episode of the 1898 Reform Movement was the death of Tan Sun-tung, a courageous, enlightened thinker. His death announced the premature end of his movement and the bankruptcy of the bourgeois reformist road. But half a century later the reactionary film *Inside Story of the Ching Court* still advocated bourgeois reformism, which had long ago gone bankrupt. This film does its utmost to advocate the absurd idea that "if China is to become rich and strong, there must be constitutional reform and modernization." Through the mouth of the Emperor Kuang Hsin, the film gives high praise to constitutional reform and modernization, extravagantly lauding reformism in such words as "the Meiji reform", "the imperial decree on constitutional reform", and "if China begins to reform in this way, in less than 30 years it will become the richest and most powerful state in the world!" This is calling madly for a bourgeois republic, for western bourgeois civilization and for the bourgeois reformist road,

which will never be permitted by the revolutionary people!

The film lauds to the skies the representative of bourgeois reformism, the Emperor Kuang Hsin in personae. It says that the emperor "wrenched his brain and sullered much vexation" . . . "in the interests of the state and the people", and pictures him as saying "as long as the affairs of state are going well . . . personal health is of little account".

Especially vicious is the way that the film, while singing the praise of emperors, kings, ministers and generals and prettily glorifying bourgeois reformism, tries by every means to amass the working people and vilify the masses as a "tribe". Towards the end of the film, the revisionist, through distorted and slanderous images of peasants and village women, extravagantly glorifies the Emperor Kuang Hsin, praising him as a "good emperor", "helping us, the people" and making them say "we all think of His Majesty!" The villagers "offer" eggs and cakes to the Emperor Kuang Hsin. On his departure, the film shows "the people kneeling along the roadside to see him off". The film makes the slander that "the masses are most obedient and most easily satisfied". Are the masses of people really such an submissive, obedient, low and ugly mob? It is absolutely impermissible to amass the working people! Chairman Mao teaches us: "The people, and the people alone, are the motive force in the making of world history."²² That the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, who backs them, have done so nihil in singing the praise of this reactionary film which glorifies emperors and kings, ministers and generals, amasses the working people and preaches bourgeois reformism serves only to expose their true colour of all-out opposition to Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought.

The Chinese people won revolutionary victory through protracted armed struggle under the leadership of Chairman Mao, and on the eve of the founding of the People's Republic of China Chairman Mao himself summed up the revolutionary struggle of the past hundred years, criticizing and repudiating the bourgeois reformist road and proclaiming that "We are bourgeois civilization, bourgeois democracy and the plan for a bourgeois republic have all gone bankrupt in the eyes of the Chinese people". What is especially instructive is the fact that after all this the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road should describe this reactionary, anti-and anti-Liutaoism film, which sings the praise of bourgeois reformism and advocates the capitalist road, as a "patriotic" film and showed it widely in every part of China without criticism and repudiation. If this is tolerable, what is intolerable?

In his article, *On the People's Democratic Dictatorship*, Chairman Mao points out: "From the time of China's defeat in the Opium War of 1840, Chinese

progresses went through a mid hardships to their goal (or truth) in the Western countries." Chinese who then sought progress maintained that "only modernization could save China, only learning from foreign sciences could modernize China." "The Japanese had been successful in learning from the West, and the Chinese also wished to learn from the Japanese." But, "imperialist aggression shattered the head dreams of the Chinese about learning from the West. It was very odd — why were the teachers always committing aggression against their pupil? The Chinese learned a good deal from the West, but they could not make it work and were never able to realize their ideas." "The salience of the October Revolution brought us Marxist-Leninism." "Under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese people, after dividing Japanese imperialism, waged the People's War of Liberation for three years and have basically won victory." "Democratic democracy has a place way to people's democracy under the leadership of the working class and the bourgeoisie republic in the people's republic. This has made it possible to achieve socialism and communism through the people's republic, to establish classes end into a world of Great Harmony. Kang Ye-wen wrote Ta Tang She, or the Book of Great Harmony, but he did not end could not find the way to achieve Great Harmony. There are bourgeois republics in foreign lands, but China cannot have a bourgeois republic because she is a country suffering under imperialist oppression. The only way is through a people's republic led by the working class."

A handful of counter-revolutionary reactionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road paid no regard to the historical facts or to the warnings given by Chairman Mao. They continued to see the reactionary and utterly traitorous Lin, inside Story of the Ching Court, to prettily witness bourgeois civilization, prettily bourgeois democracy, prettily the bourgeois republic, and advocate bourgeois reformism and the capitalist road. This line flagrant opposite to Mao Tse-tung's thought and a path attempt to restore capitalism in China. They put all these efforts into extolling the reactionary line inside Story of the Ching Court precisely because this line, which opposes revolution and bourgeois reform, was meant to beat the gongs and clear the way for them to stage a capitalist restoration. What they did was to effect to use figures from the past to eulogize the praise of capitalism and the road of bourgeois reformism, to use this line to mislead the masses and prettily bourgeois reformism. Their ultimate purpose was to overthrow the people's regime, to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat, and deliver the fruits of the victory of the revolution into the hands of the bourgeoisie.

The serious struggle that developed around the reactionary line, inside Story of the Ching Court, was by no means merely a question of one line, but a struggle between the two classes, the bourgeoisie and

the proletariat, a struggle between Marxism-Leninism. Mao Tse-tung's thought on the one hand, and bourgeois reformism and revisionist ideas on the other, a struggle between an attempt at capitalist restoration and the efforts of the proletariat opposing capitalist restoration. In the final analysis, it was a struggle to determine which would win, capitalism or socialism.

Under the leadership of the great leader Chairman Mao, the Chinese people had fought hard, bloody battles, advanced war upon war, and finally carried the struggle against imperialism and feudalism to victory. With the country liberated, where should liberated China go? To whom should the fruits of victory belong? Which class was entitled to pick the peaches that had been watered by the blood and lives of thousands upon thousands of revolutionary martyrs? Such major questions were the focus of the struggle waged between various classes in Chinese society not only at that time; they remain so even today.

The bourgeoisie wanted to snatch the fruits of victory from out of the hands of the people. They wanted to pick the peaches. They wanted newly-liberated China to take the capitalist road. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road came forward to pick the peaches on behalf of the bourgeoisie.

Since liberation, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road has gone on dreaming eight and eight of capitalist restoration, obstinately clinging to his bourgeois world outlook, zealously yearning for bourgeois reformism, trying his utmost to stop the Chinese revolution halfway and giving a big boost to capitalism.

Chairman Mao has said that the founding of the People's Republic of China on October 1, 1949, marked the basic completion of the stage of new-democratic revolution and the beginning of the stage of socialist revolution. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, however, harped on a contrary tone, painstakingly preached "consolidation of the new-democratic order," and campaigned for the development of capitalism in China.

Before and after the nationwide showing of the reactionary line inside Story of the Ching Court, he campaigned everywhere, making many eloquent speeches, issuing many sinister directives, energetically praising the so-called "progressiveness" and "glory" of the capitalist system, and spreading the absurd idea that "exploitation is no crime," "to rebel is not justified." Marx said: "Capital comes [into the world] dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt." But the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road talked such nonsense as: "In China, there is not too much capitalism, but too little"; "It is necessary to develop capitalist exploitation for such exploitation is progressive";

"Instead of being an evil, capitalist exploitation today is a contribution." He ranted that "the working people do not oppose exploitation, but welcome it"; and that "the more the capitalists, the more the exploitation, the more satisfaction we will have." He even shamelessly told a number of capitalists that "the enemy of the workers is unemployment. What they fear is that no one will exploit them. Therefore, they feel it is better to be exploited than not"; "The workers want you to exploit them. If you do not exploit them they will be miserable"; "The capitalists are also serving the people." "If you are able to exploit more, you will be benefiting both the state and the people"; "The more you exploit, the greater will be your merit and glory"; "Exploitation by the capitalists has its merits in history and such merits are immortal." He energetically advocated the idea that "exploitation is legal," saying: "It is legal to make profit, however great it may be. It is also legal to indulge in beautiful clothes, rouge and powder and wine and diet." Talking like a clown, he addressed capitalists: "My dear capitalists, I beg you to exploit me! If you exploit me, I shall be able to feed myself, and my wife and children will be able to live. If you do not exploit me, that will be terrible."

When the workers did not accept his sinking reactionary theories, he abandoned them as "lacking political understanding and having a low level of political consciousness." Speaking like an accomplice of the capitalists, he maliciously threatened the workers: "If the workers are really, it is legal (for the capitalists) to struggle against them."

At the same time, he also vigorously advocated the development of capitalist economy in the rural areas, clamouring for "long-term protection of the rich-peasant economy," and advancing the "four freedoms" freedom to produce, to hire labour, to buy and sell land and to carry on private enterprise. He advocated vigorous efforts to foster "the type of peasant who owns three horses, a plough and a cart" so as to develop the rich-peasant economy. He talked such nonsense as: "At present exploitation saves people and it is dogmatic to forbid exploitation. Now there must be exploitation and it should be welcomed. If the refugees from south of the Great Wall who go to northeast China are exploited by the rich peasants there, these refugees will be very grateful for such exploitation"; "Hiring hands is not exploitation, it increases the wealth of society." He also proposed that there should be "no limitation" on hiring hands to till the land. "It is legal to hire hands to till the land; this benefits the masses too." He ranted that "those who exploit are also socialists" and that "there is nothing to be afraid of, should there be ten thousand rich-peasant Party members in northeast China." He tried to get the capitalist economy to engulf flood the rural areas.

In singing the praise of the man-eating capitalist system of exploitation, not even the hired peasants

of the bourgeoisie nor the motley crew of apologetic for old end moderate revisionism could air with this top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road.

Each class yields its own fruit; each class speaks its own language. The top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road thinks and loves capitalism and he talks capitalism. The material philosophy that he peddles is wholly in line with the development of capitalism and the safeguarding of the bloody system of exploitation of man by man. His voice is the voice of the vampires and parasites. It thoroughly exposes his filthy, ugly bourgeois soul.

In trying to justify himself, the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road said that his case was one of "a veteran revolutionist meeting new problems."

What a "veteran revolutionist meeting new problems!"

Can one believe that a "veteran revolutionist" would work so frantically to restore capitalism?

Can one believe that a "veteran revolutionist" would so wildly oppose the great leader Chairman Mao and the great thought of Mao Tse-tung?

If he really is a "veteran revolutionist," then let him explore:

Why, on the eve of the outbreak of the War of Resistance Against Japan, did you so strenuously preach the philosophy of self-preservation, a capitalist philosophy, a traitor's philosophy, and why did you direct some people to make concessions and surrender to the Kuomintang, betray the Communist Party, openly publish "anti-Communist statements" and vow "firmly to oppose communism"?

Why, after the victory of the War of Resistance, did you advance the imperialist line of "no new stage of peace and democracy"?

Why, after the liberation, did you do your utmost to oppose the socialist transformation of capitalist industry and commerce, oppose agricultural cooperation and slash the number of agricultural cooperatives?

Why, after the completion of the transformation of capitalist industry and commerce, agriculture and handicrafts, did you propagandize with all your might the theory that class struggle was dying out, and actively promote class collaboration and the liquidation of class struggle?

Why, during the three difficult years, did you echo the ghosts and moans of the bourgeoisie and viciously attacking the three red banners [the Party's general line for building socialism, the great leap forward and the people's commune] while educating the revisionist line of "the extension of private

plots and free markets, the increase of small enterprises with sole responsibility for their own profit or loss, the fixing of output quotas based on the household" and "the liquidation of struggle in our relations with imperialism, the reactionaries and modern revisionism, and reduction of assistance and support to the revolutionary struggle of other peoples'?"

Why did you republish in 1962 that poisonous weed, that deceitful book on self-cultivation of Communists, a book which denies revolution, class struggle, the seizure of political power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, a book which opposes Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung's thought, preaches a decadent bourgeois world outlook and the reactionary philosophy of bourgeois idealism?

Why, in the socialist education movement, did you put forward and push through an opportunist line which was "Left" in form but Right in essence to sabotage the socialist education movement?

Why in the course of the great proletarian cultural revolution have you colluded with another top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road in putting forward and carrying out the bourgeois reactionary line?

There is only one answer: You are not at all a "veteran revolutionary"! You are a sham revolutionary, a counter-revolutionary. You are the Khrushchov sleeping at our side!

During the past 17 years a handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists, with the support of the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, have been launching a frenzied, all-round attack on the proletariat, spreading a great deal of poison in the fields of politics, economy, culture and education.

In this great proletarian cultural revolution, we must follow Chairman Mao's teachings, organize a mighty army of the proletarian revolution on the front of culture, thoroughly smash the frenzied attacks by this handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road, dig out the root of revisionism in our country, overthrow careerists and conspirators like Khrushchov, prevent such bad elements from usurping the leadership of the Party and the state and prevent the restoration of capitalism, so as to guarantee that our country will never change colour!

"With power and to spare we must pursue the tottering foe." This great proletarian cultural revolution initiated and led by our great leader Chairman Mao himself is aimed precisely at mobilizing the hundreds of millions of people relentlessly to pursue the handful of counter-revolutionary revisionists and the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist

road who backs them, to recapture all the citadels they have usurped and to ensure that Mao Tse-tung's thought occupies all positions. Precisely as Comrade Lin Biao said of this great proletarian cultural revolution: "It is a big campaign; it is a general attack on the ideas of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes." We must respond to the great call of Chairman Mao to hold high the revolutionary banner of criticism, plunge bravely into the battle and thoroughly criticize, repudiate and eliminate in all fields the noxious influences of the bourgeois reactionary line represented by the top Party person in authority taking the capitalist road; we must vigorously destroy the old ideas of the exploiting classes and establish the complete ascendancy of Mao Tse-tung's thought.

The road of struggle is tortuous and its development uneven. There is resistance along the forward road. We must overcome all difficulties, break down all resistance and carry the great proletarian cultural revolution through to the end; we must not give up halfway.

Unfurl the red banner of the great and invincible thought of Mao Tse-tung all over China; may it shine for ever in splendour!

Long live the victory of the movement of the great proletarian cultural revolution led personally by our respected and beloved leader Chairman Mao!

NOTES

¹"The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1963, Vol. II, p. 194.

²Mao Tse-tung, "Speech at the Meeting of People from Various Walks of Life in Yenan Celebrating Stalin's 60th Birthday Anniversary."

³"The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Eng. ed., F.L.P., Peking, 1963, Vol. II, p. 314.

⁴"On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Eng. ed., F.L.P., Peking, 1963, Vol. I, p. 170.

⁵"The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Eng. ed., F.L.P., Peking, 1963, Vol. II, p. 314.

⁶V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960, Vol. IV, p. 374.

⁷"On Practice," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Eng. ed., F.L.P., Peking, 1963, Vol. I, p. 391.

⁸Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Eng. ed., F.L.P., Peking, 1966, p. 118.

⁹"On the People's Democratic Dictatorship," *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Eng. ed., F.L.P., Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, pp. 412-414.

¹⁰K. Marx, *Capital*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, Vol. I, p. 760.